

REMARKS

The comments of the Applicant below are each preceded by related comments of the Examiner (in small, bold type)

Claims 3-7, 18-21, 28, 29, 50, 51 and 58 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 3, 18, 28 and 50 are allowable over prior art primarily because the claims each teach the processing agent executing a context and issues a read command to a memory controller in a read phase. However, the processing agent has already been mapping to Correale's Slave devices which include a memory controller and a PCI bridge (see Correale, col. 5, lines 57-58). Memory controllers and PCI bridges cannot execute a context and issue a read command to a memory controller in a read phase. Instead, the Master devices in Correale execute contexts and issue read commands as described above in the rejection of claims 1, 26 and 37.

Claim 29 is allowable over art primarily because it teaches the memory controller processes the read command to be sent to the memory resource and the context is swapped out if the read command is required to continue the execution of the context. The memory resource is already mapping to Correale's Master device such as the CPU in the rejection of claim 26 set forth above. Read commands in Correale are not sent to the Master devices but issued by them.

Claims 3, 18, 28, 29, and 50 have be rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons for which the claims on which they depend are patentable.

Canceled claims have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant reserves the right to file a continuation application to pursue the canceled claims and other broader claims.

Any circumstance in which the applicant has addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner. Any circumstance in which the applicant has made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims. Any

Applicant : Gilbert Wolrich et al.
Serial No. : 10/057,738
Filed : January 25, 2002
Page : 11 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-0618001 / P12857

circumstance in which the applicant has amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

No fees are believed to be due. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 21, 2009_____

/Rex I. Huang/_____
Rex I. Huang
Reg. No. 57,661

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945